WIS-98/26/Oct-PH
TAUP 2527-98
ANL-HEP-PR-98-123
hep-ph/9809347

A useful approximate isospin equality for charmless strange B Decays

Harry J. Lipkin *

Department of Particle Physics Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel

School of Physics and Astronomy, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

High Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL 60439-4815, USA

HJL@axp1.hep.anl.gov

arXiv:hep-ph/9810351v1 13 Oct 1998

Abstract

A useful inequality is obtained if charmless strange B decays are assumed to be dominated by a $\Delta I = 0$ transition like that from the gluonic penguin diagram and the contributions of all other diagrams including the tree, electroweak penguin and annihilation diagrams are small but not negligible. The interference contributions which are linear in these other amplitudes are included but the direct contributions which are quadratic are neglected.

It is now believed that charmless strange B decays are dominated by the gluonic penguin diagram. If all other diagrams are negligible, the branching ratios for sets of decays to states in the same isospin multiplets are uniquely related by isospin because the gluonic penguin leads to a pure I=1/2 final state, and there is no simple mechanism in the standard model that can give CP violation.

---

*Supported in part by The German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research and Development (GIF) and by the U.S. Department of Energy, Division of High Energy Physics, Contract W-31-109-ENG-38.

If the tree diagram produced by the $\bar{b} \to \bar{u}u\bar{s}$ transition at the quark level also contributes, the isospin analysis becomes non-trivial, much more interesting and CP violation can be observed. This case has been considered in great detail by Nir and Quinn [1].

Our purpose here is to point out and discuss an intermediate case, where the amplitude from the tree diagram is not negligible but still sufficiently small by comparison with the gluonic penguin that its contribution to branching ratios need be considered only to first order, and higher order contributions can be neglected. An interesting approximate sum rule is obtained which can check the validity of this approximation and guide the search for CP violation.

We consider here the $B \to K\pi$ decays. Exactly the same considerations hold for all similar decays into a strange meson and an isovector nonstrange meson. An extension incorporating also the decay into the isoscalar strange meson; e.g. ω is presented below for all ideally mixed nonets.

The gluonic penguin diagram leads to a pure isospin 1/2 state. Its contributions to all $B \to K\pi$ amplitudes, denoted by P are simply related by isospin.

$$P(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) = -P(B^o \to K^o\pi^o) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot P(B^o \to K^+\pi^-) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot P(B^+ \to K^o\pi^+) \equiv P \tag{1}$$

The tree diagram has two independent contributions corresponding to the color-favored and color-suppressed couplings of the final quark-antiquark pairs. Their amplitudes, denoted by T_f and T_s are also simply related by isospin.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot T_f(B^o \to K^+\pi^-) = T_f(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) \equiv T_f \tag{2a}$$

$$T_s(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) = T_s(B^o \to K^o\pi^o) \equiv T_s \tag{2b}$$

In the approximation where we consider the contributions of the tree amplitudes only to first order, we obtain:

$$BR(B^o \to K^+\pi^-) \approx 2P^2 + 4P \cdot T_f \tag{3a}$$

$$BR(B^o \to K^o\pi^o) \approx P^2 - 2P \cdot T_s \tag{3b}$$

$$BR(B^+ \to K^o\pi^+) \approx 2P^2 \tag{3c}$$

$$BR(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) \approx P^2 + 2P \cdot T_f + 2P \cdot T_s \tag{3d}$$

This leads to the approximate equality

$$BR(B^o \to K^+\pi^-) - 2BR(B^o \to K^o\pi^o) \approx 2BR(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) - BR(B^+ \to K^o\pi^+) \approx$$

$$\approx 4P \cdot T_f + 4P \cdot T_s = 4P(T_f + T_s) \cdot \cos(\phi_{\rm P} - \phi_{\rm T} - \phi_{\rm S}) \tag{4a}$$

where ϕ_P and ϕ_T are the weak phases respectively of the penguin and tree amplitudes and ϕ_S is the strong phase difference between the two. Note that both the left-hand and right hand sides vanish independently for any transition like the pure gluonic penguin that leads to a pure I=1/2 state. The relation (4) therefore is due entirely to interference between the penguin I=1/2 amplitude and the I=3/2 component of the tree amplitude. This immediately leads to the correspnding expression for the charge-conjugate decays,

$$BR(\bar{B}^o \to K^-\pi^+) - 2BR(\bar{B}^o \to \bar{K}^o\pi^o) \approx 2BR(B^- \to K^-\pi^o) - BR(B^- \to \bar{K}^o\pi^-) \approx$$

$$4P(T_f + T_s) \cdot \cos(\phi_{\rm P} - \phi_{\rm T} + \phi_{\rm S}) \tag{4b}$$

The direct CP violation is seen to be given by

$$\frac{2BR(B^- \to K^-\pi^o) - 2BR(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) - BR(B^- \to \bar{K}^o\pi^-) + BR(B^+ \to K^o\pi^+)}{2BR(B^- \to K^-\pi^o) + 2BR(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) - BR(B^- \to \bar{K}^o\pi^-) - BR(B^+ \to K^o\pi^+)} \approx$$

$$\approx \tan(\phi_{\rm P} - \phi_{\rm T})\tan(\phi_{\rm S}) \tag{5}$$

The same equality (4) is easily seen in the formalism used by Nir and Quinn [1] using their three amplitudes denoted by U, V and W. The W amplitude is the penguin amplitude and the the two tree amplitudes U and V are linear combinations of our T_f and T_s amplitudes, defined by isospin properties rather than quark diagrams.

$$BR(B^o \to K^+\pi^-) - 2BR(B^o \to K^o\pi^o) = -2W\cdot(U+V) + 2(V^2 - U^2) \approx -2W\cdot(U+V) \tag{6a}$$

$$2BR(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) - BR(B^+ \to K^o\pi^+) = -2W\cdot(U+V) - 2(V^2 - U^2) \approx -2W\cdot(U+V) \tag{6b}$$

It is interesting to note that here also one sees the apparent miracle that the *same* linear combination of the two tree amplitudes, $U + V$ appears in both expressions (6a) and (6b) and that the approximate equality follows from the approximation that quadratic terms in U and V are negligible in comparison with the product of the linear terms and the dominant penguin amplitude W.

$$(V^2 - U^2) << W \cdot (U + V) \tag{7}$$

However, a simple isospin analysis shows that this is no miracle and that the approximate equality (4) holds also when contributions of annihilation diagrams, diagrams in which a flavor-changing final state interaction like charge exchange follows the weak tree diagram and electroweak penguins. We first note that both the annihilation diagram and the charge exchange diagram which proceeds via the quark annihilation and pair creation transition $u\bar{u} \rightarrow$ gluons $\rightarrow d\bar{d}$ lead to pure I=1/2 final states and their contributions cancel in the sum rule (4).

The electroweak penguin amplitudes contain both I=1/2 and I=3/2 components. This amplitude which we denote by P_{EW} can be written as the sum of a contribution in which the electroweak boson creates an isoscalar $q\bar{q}$ pair and one which we denote by P_u in which the electroweak boson creates a $u\bar{u}$ pair. The contribution with the isoscalar pair is proportional to the gluonic penguin. Thus

$$P_{EW} = \xi \cdot P + P_u \tag{8}$$

where ξ is a small parameter. To first order in P_{EW} the contribution of the $\xi \cdot P$ term satisfies the approximate equality (4), since the contributions of both sides vanish. The P_u term arises from the quark transition

$$\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}u\bar{u} \tag{9a}$$

This then leads to the hadronic transition

$$B(\bar{b}q) \rightarrow \bar{s}u\bar{u}q \tag{9b}$$

But these are exactly the same as the tree transitions (2) except that the color favored and color suppressed transitions are reversed. Here the $u\bar{u}$ is a color singlet and the transitions in which this $u\bar{u}$ pair combine to make a π^o are color favored. We can therefore write P_u as the sum of a color-favored and color suppressed term,

$$P_u = P_{uf} + P_{us} \tag{10}$$

and note that they satisfy the isospin relations analogous to (2),

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot P_{us}(B^o \to K^+\pi^-) = P_{us}(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) \equiv P_{us} \tag{11a}$$

$$P_{uf}(B^+ \to K^+\pi^o) = P_{uf}(B^o \to K^o\pi^o) \equiv P_{uf} \tag{11b}$$

We can therefore generalize the equalities (4) by replacing T_f and T_s by

$$T_f \to T'_f \equiv T_f + P_{us} \tag{12a}$$

$$T_s \to T'_s \equiv T_f + P_{uf} \tag{12b}$$

We thus see that the inclusion of the electroweak penguin has the effect of adding a term with the same isospin properties as the gluonic penguin and terms with the isospin properties of the color-suppressed and color-favored tree diagrams, and therefore do not affect the approximate equality (4).

The reason for the equality is easily seen by noting the isospin properties of all charmless strange decays. The weak interaction produces either a $\Delta I = 0$ transition which leads to an $I = 1/2$ final state or a $\Delta I = 1$ transition which can lead to both $I = 1/2$ and $I = 3/2$ final states [2]. There are therefore three independent isospin amplitudes. The four decay branching ratios therefore depend in the general case on five parameters, three magnitudes and two relative phases and no simple equality between the branching ratios is obtainable. However, in the approximation where only linear terms in the $\Delta I = 1$ amplitudes are considered, a phase convention can be chosen in which the dominant $\Delta I = 0$ amplitude is real and only the real parts of the $\Delta I = 1$ amplitudes contribute. The four decay branching ratios now depend on only three real parameters, and the equality (4) is therefore obtained.

The same approach can be applied to charmless decays to a strange pseudoscalar and a nonstrange vector meson. Here the ideal mixing of the ρ and ω enables inclusion of the $K\omega$ final states in the analysis if the OZI rule is assumed [3]. We first express the ρ^o and ω states in terms of their $u\bar{u}$ and $d\bar{d}$ components, denoted respectively as V_u amd V_d,

$$|\rho^o\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot (|V_u\rangle - |V_d\rangle); \quad |\omega\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot (|V_u\rangle + |V_d\rangle) \tag{13}$$

The analogs of eqs. (1-2) have a particularly simple form when written in terms of the flavor eigenstates V_u amd V_d,

$$P(B^+ \to K^+ V_u) = P(B^o \to K^o V_d) = P(B^o \to K^+ \rho^-) = P(B^+ \to K^o \rho^+) \equiv \sqrt{2} \cdot P \tag{14a}$$

$$T_f(B^o \to K^+ \rho^-) = T_f(B^+ \to K^+ V_u) \equiv \sqrt{2} \cdot T_f \tag{14b}$$

$$T_s(B^+ \to K^+ V_u) = T_s(B^o \to K^o V_u) \equiv T_s \tag{14c}$$

The negative signs and $\sqrt{2}$ factors which appear in eqs. (1-2) as isospin Clebsch-Gordan coefficients are completely absent in this quark-flavor representation. These factors appear in the quark model description only in the wave functions of the ρ^o and π^o. This description enables extending the treatment beyond isospin and also including the ω. This implicitly asssumes the OZI rule which discards the penguin diagram in which three gluons create the omega [3]. It also neglects the similar electroweak diagrams in which the electroweak boson creates the ω. Substituting the ω and ρ wave functions from eq. (13) into the relations (14) brings them to the form of eqs. (1-2) with the additional predictions for the $K\omega$ decays.

$$P(B^+ \to K^+ \rho^o) = P(B^+ \to K^+ \omega) = -P(B^o \to K^o \rho^o) = P(B^o \to K^o \omega) =$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot P(B^o \to K^+ \rho^-) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot P(B^+ \to K^o \rho^+) \equiv P \tag{15a}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot T_f(B^o \to K^+ \rho^-) = T_f(B^+ \to K^+ \rho^o) = T_f(B^+ \to K^+ \omega) \equiv T_f \tag{15b}$$

$$T_s(B^+ \to K^+ \rho^o) = T_s(B^+ \to K^+ \omega) = T_s(B^o \to K^o \rho^o) = T_s(B^o \to K^o \omega) \equiv T_s \tag{15c}$$

In the approximation where we consider the contributions of amplitudes other than gluonic penguin only to first order, we obtain:

$$BR(B^o \to K^+\rho^-) \approx 2P^2 + 4P \cdot T_f \tag{16a}$$

$$BR(B^o \to K^o\rho^o) \approx P^2 - 2P \cdot T_s \tag{16b}$$

$$BR(B^+ \to K^o\rho^+) \approx 2P^2 \tag{16c}$$

$$BR(B^+ \to K^+\rho^o) = BR(B^+ \to K^+\omega) \approx P^2 + 2P \cdot T_f + 2P \cdot T_s \tag{16d}$$

$$BR(B^o \to K^o\omega) \approx P^2 + 2P \cdot T_s \tag{16e}$$

This leads again to an approximate equalities

$$BR(B^o \to K^+\rho^-) - 2BR(B^o \to K^o\rho^o) \approx 2BR(B^+ \to K^+\rho^o) - BR(B^+ \to K^o\rho^+) \approx$$

$$\approx 4P \cdot T_f + 4P \cdot T_s = 4P(T_f + T_s) \cdot \cos(\phi_{\rm P} - \phi_{\rm T} - \phi_{\rm S}) \tag{17a}$$

$$BR(\bar{B}^o \to K^-\rho^+) - 2BR(\bar{B}^o \to \bar{K}^o\rho^o) \approx 2BR(B^- \to K^-\rho^o) - BR(B^- \to \bar{K}^o\rho^-) \approx$$

$$4P(T_f + T_s) \cdot \cos(\phi_{\rm P} - \phi_{\rm T} + \phi_{\rm S}) \tag{17b}$$

where ϕ_P and ϕ_T are again weak phases respectively of penguin and tree amplitudes and ϕ_S is the strong phase difference between the two. The relation (17) is again due entirely to interference between the penguin I=1/2 amplitude and the I=3/2 component of other amplitudes.

The inclusion of the ω gives the well-known equality [3] (16d) and a new approximate equality,

$$BR(B^o \to K^o\rho^o) + BR(B^o \to K^o\omega) \approx BR(B^+ \to K^o\rho^+) \approx 2P^2 \tag{18}$$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank Yosef Nir and Jonathan L. Rosner for helpful discussions and comments.

REFERENCES

[1] Yosef Nir and Helen Quinn Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 541
[2] M. Gronau, O. Hernández, D. London, and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **52**, (1995) 6374 .
[3] Harry J. Lipkin, hep-ph/9708253, Phys. Lett. **B433** (1998) 117